Technical Panel E-Government Architecture Work Group Friday November 3, 10 a.m. to noon Executive Building, 5th Floor Conference Room 521 South 14th Street Lincoln, Nebraska

Minutes

1. Participants

Dave Berkland (IMServices)
Jerry Brown (IMServices)
John Fiene (University of Nebraska)
Tim Erickson (NOL)
Dale Fangmeier (IMServices)
Steve Henderson (IMServices)
Greg Lemon (Deputy Secretary of State)
Terry Lowe, (City of Lincoln)
Steve Rathje, (Dept of Natural Resources)
Steve Schafer (CIO)
Art Zygielbaum (NETC)

- 2. Review and changes to minutes of prior meetings: none
- 3. Discuss draft document

Initial discussion centered on the section on Purpose and Objectives. The scope of the document was described as an umbrella covering the full range of activities necessary to support the deployment of the state's e-government strategy. The document must be consistent with other efforts of the NITC Technical Panel to define a technical architecture.

The agenda invited comments on possible statements of principles and objectives. Although there were no explicit suggestions, certain themes arose during other discussions that represent possible principles and objectives:

- A single common portal should provide access to government information and services;
- Deployment support services for e-government must insure security and privacy;
- E-government architecture should provide adaptability to accommodate change;
- The architecture should encourage creativity, initiative, and innovation by agencies.

Some of the issues that need to be addressed in developing the e-government architecture include:

- Cost of integration of isolated, incompatible systems
- Cost of development tools and software
- Transition to a new architecture
- Transition to new methods and processes
- Dynamic list of current supported products
- Process for identifying and choosing products that will be supported

Much of the discussion dealt with different approaches for implementing an e-government strategy. The models range from complete laissez-faire to a single source of development

and control, with strict standardization. Middle points would allow for different degrees of decentralization, with standardization where necessary to achieve a common goal. Discussion identified a variety of advantages and disadvantages with different approaches.

There was clear interest in arriving at some consensus on the general issue of governance, before proceeding further with specifying the architecture for e-government.

The next version of the draft architecture will include a section on implementation. It will address issues pertaining to development and enforcement of standards. It will describe a possible model for creating a standards-based architecture, which preserves creativity, initiative and innovation at the agency level.

- 4. Discuss other recommendations (not discussed at this meeting)
 - a. design standards
 - b. evaluation of current architecture
 - c. gap analysis (problems and issues)
- 5. Next steps and meeting dates
 The next meeting is Wednesday November 29, 10:00 a.m.